

Message

From: Steketee, John [steketee.john@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/18/2017 8:23:49 PM
To: Zolnierczyk, Kenneth [zolnierczyk.kenneth@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: MKC - TSCA Approval Conditions - LCD Meeting

Ken. Ok. What about the monitoring data you requested from Kipp? Have they sent that to you yet? Thx.
 John

From: Zolnierczyk, Kenneth
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 2:11 PM
To: Wilson, Jennifer; Steketee, John; Hansen, Janette; Ramanauskas, Peter; Petrovski, David
Subject: Re: MKC - TSCA Approval Conditions - LCD Meeting

The results of the modeling done by the water utility indicated that PERC would move vertically and penetrate the Eau Claire layer and then move horizontally to the well. We don't have any data on groundwater flow beneath the Eau Claire and to the best of my knowledge, neither does Kipp, who produced no records of any wells at that depth. However, Madison's consultant has used the Dane County Groundwater Model and I presume they suggested the location of their proposed sentinel well. I think we need to talk with the Madison Water Utility and their consultant, about placement of any additional wells and the possibility of obtaining their data on groundwater flow at these depths. Apparently, these deep wells cost about \$100k and we should be sure of what we ask Kipp to do. Ideally, the proposed wells from Kipp and Madison, screened at proper depths, may be adequate, but we won't know this until the determination is made by the hydrogeologists.

I spoke with Darcy last week and she clearly stated that the EPA should consult with their partner, the WDNR drinking water program, before talking to Madison's drinking water program. I'm just the messenger on this.

I'll be checking emails occasionally until I'm back.

- Ken

From: Wilson, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 12:06:58 PM
To: Steketee, John; Hansen, Janette; Zolnierczyk, Kenneth; Ramanauskas, Peter; Petrovski, David
Subject: FW: MKC - TSCA Approval Conditions - LCD Meeting

Hi All,

One more thing I forgot to mention, the two monitoring wells I am requesting below should not only be between the Facility and Madison's well, but in the path of the ground water flow. I think this is probably obvious, but I thought I would add that.

Thank you,
 Jenny

-----Original Message-----

From: Wilson, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Cisneros, Jose <cisneros.jose@epa.gov>; Poy, Thomas <poy.thomas@epa.gov>; Hansen, Janette <hansen.janette@epa.gov>; Beedle, Michael <beedle.michael@epa.gov>; Steketee, John <steketee.john@epa.gov>; Mendoza, Stephen <mendoza.stephen@epa.gov>; Arrazola, Ignacio <arrazola.ignacio@epa.gov>
Cc: Zolnierczyk, Kenneth <zolnierczyk.kenneth@epa.gov>; Ramanauskas, Peter <ramanauskas.peter@epa.gov>; Petrovski, David <petrovski.david@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: MKC - TSCA Approval Conditions - LCD Meeting

Hi Joe,

Thank you for copying us.

John,

Ken is out of the office until after the 1st of January. He said he would check his e-mail occasionally, though.

Janette Hansen, the Acting Section Chief of the Enforcement Team in Drinking Water, thinks LCD is taking the lead on these two matters. We are fine with whatever remedies are proposed as long as they keep the PCBs and the PCE away from Madison's well.

However, below are a few thoughts I think I already expressed about WDNR's PCB settlement and a couple of thoughts about the PCE contamination. I believe Ken agrees with all of these thoughts based on my discussions with him, but he should feel free to disagree if he is checking his e-mail. Also, Peter and Dave, please feel free to chime in if you disagree or have other ideas.

- I would prefer to have at least two monitoring wells installed between the Facility and Madison's well for monitoring the PCBs and it would be nice if they were screened at multiple depths to monitor the PCE plume as well.
- I think we want the unfiltered PCB concentration measured because I believe the PCBs travel with the soil particles. Ken and Peter know more about this than I do, but I think by only analyzing for PCBs in the dissolved phase, the company will not be painting an accurate picture of the contamination as those numbers will be much lower than the numbers in an undissolved sample.
- I would like the second PCE plume pumped and treated. I think the Company needs a new well for it because I don't think GW-1 will capture it based on the PCE figure that Madison's consultant created.

Thank you,
Jenny

-----Original Message-----

From: Cisneros, Jose
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 9:12 AM
To: Poy, Thomas <poy.thomas@epa.gov>; Wilson, Jennifer <wilson.jenniferA@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: MKC - TSCA Approval Conditions - LCD Meeting

FYI.
Joe

-----Original Message-----

From: Steketee, John
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2017 8:53 AM
To: Beedle, Michael <beedle.michael@epa.gov>; Ramanauskas, Peter <ramanauskas.peter@epa.gov>; Zolnierczyk, Kenneth <zolnierczyk.kenneth@epa.gov>; Petrovski, David <petrovski.david@epa.gov>
Cc: Cisneros, Jose <Cisneros.Jose@epa.gov>; Mendoza, Stephen <mendoza.stephen@epa.gov>; Arrazola, Ignacio <arrazola.ignacio@epa.gov>
Subject: MKC - TSCA Approval Conditions - LCD Meeting

Ken:

John

Note -

This communication may contain privileged, confidential or proprietary information that may be protected from disclosure under law. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, use or disclose the contents of this communication to others. Please notify the sender that you have received this in error. Please then delete the communication from your system and destroy any copies of it. Thank you.